

Mr. David J. Garrow
Political Science Dept.
CCNY,
New York, N.Y. 10031

11/20/88

Dear David,

Professional Historians and political scientists, like those of us you regard as an ignorant rabble to be talked down to, are entitled to your biases and prejudices and preconceptions and, absent self-restraint, are licensed to indulge ^{them} as you do in today's Washington Post Book World, but this does not extend to ignorance and your flaunting of your own ignorance. (Please excuse my worse than usual typing; I'm recovering from eye surgery.)

Aside from perhaps the belief that you know all there is to know about anything, what qualifies you to all or any part of:

"...an ongoing fascination- at least on the part of authors and publishers- with the real and imagined minutiae of the Kennedy assassination itself, a fascination that shows no sign of diminution even as the most determined conspiracy theorists flirt with science fiction in their overheated imaginings... To anyone who has followed even in a half-hearted fashion the evolution of the burgeoning literature on ~~the~~ John Kennedy's shooting, the sinking feeling that less is known with each passing year - and arriving book- becomes inescapable."

Do you, personally, qualify as the "half-hearted" student of the literature? Your language in this diatribe reflects ignorance, not even half-hearted knowledge. Aside from this, what I have no reason to believe troubles you at all, it is grossly unfair and misleading and in some respects it is false.

What in the world do you mean by "minutiae?" The backbone of history and of law and justice is not what is commonly referred to as "minutiae?" Or is this an ignorant way of seeking to put down what he cannot address on the basis of fact and his personal knowledge? Or of seeking to diminish the solid works of years ago by bracketing them with the current nonsense of the Davises and the Scheims? How can the appearance of such junk make less be known when there is what you ignore, solid works of the past?

What do you know of either the Warren Commission, the books about it or what I am confident David Belin largely ignores, what those of us you and he seek to put down have brought to light from official suppression, that entitles you to offer the opinion that Belin is "persuasive" in his defense of his own past that you and he refer to as his defense of the Commission? Do you know enough about Belin to hold an intelligent opinion about him and what he says and has said and done, including in other than his own self-serving version, what he did and did not do on the Commission?

What do you really know, in other than a Belinesque version, ^{enough about} "the physical facts of the Kennedy shooting" to say to so large and trusting an audience, not to mention trusting editors, that "for all practical purposes" these "physical facts ... can no longer be disputed?"

I ~~minfe~~ ^{and} no words on this - you lie and it is an ugly, ~~an~~ disgusting lie coming from one of your discipline when in the real context you ignore you are talking about the most subversive crime possible in a society like ours.

What if anything at all do you really know of the physical facts, the actualities, not the self-serving representations of the Belins or his Commission?

Do you know, or is this part of what you seek to dismiss as "minutiae," that on the most basic of facts about the assassination, what shots hit who, to this day both the Secret Service and the FBI disagree and as of my last knowledge sneered to themselves about the Commission's version. (And this, by the way, you ~~my~~ eminent ignoramus, sir, is the actual theorizing, ^{by} the officials' of all levels, as you'd know if you had read and understood the Warren report itself.)

In any translation of your closing words into everyday, dispassionate English, you actually wall for an end to critical writing on this subject, this most subversive of crimes, this most dubious official inquiry into what, contrary to the other opinions you offer, turned the world around.

For shame, David! You belittle yourself, you demean your discipline, you Orwellize when more than at any time I can recall, and I've lived a third as long as our country, the people have an urgent need to know what is real ~~and~~ true about so much, including how their government serves them and their system of self-gpvernment, really ^{then} ~~of~~ freedom.

This outrageous stuff comes with even poorer grace from one whose own work was to a large degree made possible by those he deprecates for without the effort of which you are well aware and to which neither you nor any other professional historian or political scientist contributed in any way, those records would not have been available to you and ~~the~~ others under the Freedom of Information Act. Done by a "conspiracy theorist," was it, David? Some of that "imagined ^{ties} ~~minutiae~~?" Perhaps "science fiction in their overheated imaginings?"

I'm sorry for you that you are capable of something as indecent, as dishonest, as this is,

cc Nina Kimy, Book World editor

Sincerely,

David
Harold Weisberg